

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number:

0700-0563

Case Title:

Cass County PWSD #9

Subject of Report:

Report of interview of (b) (6), PWSD #9 Board Member

Reporting Office:

Kansas City Area Office

Activity Date:

January 4, 2018

Reporting Official and Date:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Agent

11-JAN-2018, Signed by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Approving Official and Date:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Assistant Special Agent in Charge

17-JAN-2018, Approved by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Assistant Special Agent in Charge

SYNOPSIS

(b) (6) stated several issues regarding the operation of the PWSD #9 were brought to the attention of the Board of Directors. (b) (6) stated the Board looked into the issues resulting in a 1-month suspension with no pay and benefits imposed on (b) (6) of the PWSD #9.

DETAILS

On January 4, 2018, SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conducted an interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6). The interview took place at his residence located at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). (b) (6) was provided introduction, presented official credentials and explained the nature of the visit. (b) (6) was advised he was not being detained and was free to end the interview at any time. (b) (6) agreed to answer questions. The interview was recorded via an audio recorder and is attached to this report. The following is a summary of statements provided voluntarily by (b) (6).

(b) (6) indicated he is self employed as a (b) (6) on the Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the Board) for the Public Water and Sewer District #9 (hereinafter referred to PWSD #9). (b) (6) is also the Boards representative for Tri County, which is the source for the PWSD #9's water. (b) (6) was asked why he thought we (SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)) paid him a visit. (b) (6) stated it was brought to the Boards attention by one of the employees this summer that "maybe our water samples wasn't being pulled right, for our tests". (b) (6) stated the employee first approached the Board president so he (b) (6) didn't want to name the person because he was informed by the president, not the employee. (b) (6) identified the Board president as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

(b) (6) explained the Board mainly gives guidance and provides oversight, sets rates, approves budgets, handles any problems that may arise that the staff (PWSD #9) can't handle, as well as reviewing water usages, finances etc.. (b) (6) stated the Board does not make notifications to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), instead relies on the employees. (b) (6) stated the Board meets once a month, almost every month without question. He did say, the Board failed to meet once last fall, but recalled having a special meeting in between to approve a couple of things (September/October).

(b) (6) identified (b) (6) as the Manager of the PWSD #9, and identified him as his (b) (6) cousin. (b) (6) reports every month to the Board, such things as any problems, ie. water leaks, water usage, billings etc. (b) (6) identified the PWSD #9 secretary as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), further stating (b) (6) and (b) (6), have been there for over twenty-five (25) years. As far as the Board meetings are concerned, (b) (6) stated the entire staff (PWSD #9) usually attends the Board meetings. This is primarily to ensure that everyone knows what is said and/or discussed. (b) (6) was asked if any issues have come up in the past, regarding the PWSD #9. (b) (6) stated mainly some personnel issues; originally the staff consisted of (b) (6), and (b) (6), to adding part time people, to now two new (2) full time people. (b) (6) agreed adding more staff brought some "growing pains." (b) (6) stated there were never any real issues until this past May (2017), again stating that someone (later identified as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)) brought to the presidents (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attention that the water

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number:

0700-0563

samples may not have been collected right. [REDACTED] stated the Board addressed the issue with (b) (6), who (b) (6) assured the Board if there were any problems he (b) (6), would address it. [REDACTED] stated there are six (6) sample properties, further stating it seemed the issue was the samples weren't always drawn at the proper location. [REDACTED] stated the Board never had any positive knowledge the samples were not collected properly, but wanted to correct any potential problems moving forward.

[REDACTED] stated in the past (when he lived with his parents), he recalled someone taking water samples in the basement of his parents' house (which is now his current home), but in recent times [REDACTED] recalled someone possibly taking a water sample from the outside water hydrant. So he really couldn't say how often, time of the day or if anyone has taken a water sample at his home, which is and has been a sample location for a long period of time.

In regards to financial, [REDACTED] stated, to the best of his knowledge all the PWSD #9 staff would need credit cards but couldn't say for sure who has them, but assumed the manager (b) (6) and the secretary ((b) (6), [REDACTED]) have one. The Board reviews the credit card statements every month, primarily the charges/expenses summary. [REDACTED] doesn't recall any issues regarding the credit card statements. [REDACTED] was also asked about potential misuse of fuel purchases, to which, [REDACTED] opined the Board had no concrete findings to prove it. [REDACTED] stated, in regards to the iPad, he, himself looked into that. [REDACTED] stated there was a charge every month that totaled two thousand to twenty-four hundred dollars (\$2000 to \$2400) for a period of time. [REDACTED] stated that charge was billed to PWSD #9. [REDACTED] stated the owner of the iPad was (b) (6), (b) (7), but commented the data usage was very minimal. [REDACTED] stated (b) (6) admitted to setting up that account. [REDACTED] stated the Board addressed all the concerns (water sample collection and the iPad) by imposing (b) (6), a one (1) month suspension with no pay and benefits. SA (b) (6), (b) (7) asked if the Board discussed notifying the MDNR of the issues with the water sample collection. [REDACTED] stated (b) (6), would be the person to ask.

[REDACTED] declined to comment on the reasons leading to (b) (6), (b) (7) employment termination. He requested that question go through the Board. But [REDACTED] did state that the Board thought the PWSD #9 had grown too much and needed to be cut back.

ATTACHMENT

(b) (6), (b) (7) WMA